

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. <b>09/776,780</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Zisapel et al.</b>
	Examiner <b>Kenneth R. Coulter</b>	Art Unit <b>2141</b>

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kenneth R. Coulter

(3) Amir Peless

(2) Sanford Colb (Reg. No. 26,856)

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Apr 2, 2003

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 5-12, 18, 19, and 21-27

Identification of prior art discussed:

Rochberger et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,205,146); Bare (U.S. Pat. No. 6,493,318); Kenner et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,112,239)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner agreed that claim 11 is in condition for allowance. Applicant stated that claim 12 will be reintroduced with a new claim number and modifications related to the server. Applicant stated that claim 6 will be modified to indicate "directing additional requests". Applicant stated that claim 7 refers to the current server load (capacity), not the connection load as in the prior art. Applicant stated that in claims 10 and 19 there must be two attributes. Applicant stated that in claim 21 will be modified to specify a "server load" and "server capacity". With regard to claims 24 - 26, Applicant stated that the prior art does not disclose at least 2 of the stated attributes. Examiner will recheck the references and update the search after an Amendment is filed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

KENNETH R. COULTER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  


Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required